Gen. Bradley's Plea for Peace, P. 3

Flim-Flam from the White House: Missiles Expert Contradicts Ike on Re-Entry Problem, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 44 NOVEMBER 18, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

What They Cut Out of That Report on Soviet Schools

That report on *Education in the USSR* which the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare issued last week was completed in October of last year. Nervous officials kept revising it all over the Department for 12 months. When finally released for publication, it omitted the two points about Soviet education it is most important to press home in the U.S. today. One is that higher education in the Soviet Union is not only free but that most students are paid a salary. The other is that scientists, scholars and teachers enjoy a higher position socially and financially in the Soviet Union than in the United States.

Did Folsom Use An Earlier Draft?

That the report had been heavily revised came to light when the released text was compared with the preview by Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare before the Conference on Engineering and Scientific Education in Chicago Nov. 2, from which we printed excerpts last week. Secretary Folsom in discussing the forthcoming report on Soviet education stressed the need for raising the teacher's status here and for enabling poorer students to attend college. "Society as a whole," Secretary Folsom said, "benefits from the education of each individual, and it is only proper that society share . . . the cost of his education." Secretary Folsom went on to contrast Soviet colleges where education is free "and all but the weakest students are actually paid to go to college." But the report, when it appeared, did not seem to make the points the Secretary had stressed, nor contain the information indicated.

Talents Lost Through Poverty

The revisions and the fuzzing of these basic points reflect the first premise of Eisenhower education policy, which is that schools are a local and State responsibility while universities should depend more on private and corporate gifts. This premise has hobbled the work of the various committees set up here from time to time in a burst of publicity to study education and science. Secretary Folsom, in his speech, cited one of them, the President's Committee on Education Beyond The High School. It has already made two reports, one in November, 1956, and the other in July 1957.

The first report of that Committee said that every year approximately 100,000 of our most talented high school students do not go on to college, primarily because they cannot afford it. The second report, last July, said they could not afford it because 20 percent of U.S. families earned less than $1500 a year before Federal income tax; 45 percent less than $3,000; 60 percent less than $4,000; and 84 percent less than $6,000. Obviously these families cannot afford to send children to college at a basic cost which now approximates $2,000 a year.

Omitted

"Consistent with the official esteem in which science and technology are held in the Soviet Union, the scholar and scientist enjoy high salaries and a number of privileges which enable them to maintain a living standard —relative to that of most of the population—higher than is found among his colleagues in any Western country."

—From an earlier draft of Education in the USSR.

"The teacher, the unsung hero and much maligned bulwark of our educational system, occupies a preferred position in Soviet society. A professor's salary and prestige equal those of high governmental and industrial officials."

—Norton T. Dodge, as quoted in an earlier draft.

The result, as Secretary Folsom said, is that "about one-third of the top quarter of our high school graduates do not go to college . . . a serious national waste." Compare the Soviet Union, where traditionally higher education had been free. From 1940 to 1955 fees were charged but these have since been dropped. Students are paid a monthly stipend to cover living costs and these stipends are increased for good work, and may be lost for bad. An earlier draft of the report pointed out that 98 percent of the student body at Moscow University received such stipends. A similar system here would develop talents which now fall by the wayside because of poverty.

But What Were The Teaching Hours?

Departmental bureaucrats with a sharp eye on the desire of the White House to hold down expenditures cut out the facts which would have provided a clear picture of this sharp contrast. They did the same in discussing teacher salaries. The results at points are almost ludicrous. At page 215 of the report, for example, it is said that "most teachers in the Soviet Union earn about double their base pay because they work twice the number of hours specified." But the number of hours specified has been omitted. Earlier drafts, according to officials through whose hands they passed, showed that Soviet primary school teachers got their base pay for 4 hours a day, and teachers in the secondary grades for 3 hours a day, or 18 hours a week. So the regular schedule is not a heavy one. Extra hours and even such extra tasks as marking papers receive extra pay. Here a teacher in secondary schools makes considerably less than a factory worker; there, the teacher may make three times as much.

(*Continued on Page Four*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Flim-Flam, Administrative and Scientific, in That TV-Cast from the White House

Missile Expert Contradicts Eisenhower on The "Re-Entry" Problem

The only thing new in the President's first TV cast on science and security was not true. . . . We have not solved the so-called re-entry problem, despite that odd cone put on view in the White House study. . . . A top missile expert at an 'off the record briefing of top newsmen the day after Mr. Eisenhower spoke said, "Absolutely, positively and without question, we have not—repeat not—solved this problem." . . . Nevertheless, rather than step on presidential toes, most newsmen and the Associated Press left this out of their story on the briefing. . . . Only the independent and respected *Washington Star* (Nov. 10) used this, but there has been no denial from White House or Pentagon. . . . The Administration's press agents just couldn't resist a bit of flim-flam. . . . It is quite possible, and the subject is high on the agenda of the Senate investigation to open next week, that the President was never given the full facts. . . . The missiles expert, who will be a witness in that inquiry, said security prevented him from explaining why the cone did not prove we could get a missile back from outer space without its being burned up by the tremendous friction. . . . The President's first speech was otherwise a tepid, uninspired affair, appallingly poor copy. . . .

Can't Even Get The Name Right

Like Stassen on disarmament, Dr. James R. Killian of MIT is to be a "Special Assistant" to the President on science. . . . These Special Assistantships leave a man hanging in the air, with no power of his own except the dubious one of access to the President (if and when), an easy target for the heads of departments. . . . Left wholly unclear, in a situation where clear chains of command are important, is Dr. Killian's relationship to the so-called "missiles czar" in the Pentagon, William M. Holaday, whose own relationship in turn to the Secretary of Defense is as glamorously ambiguous. . . . Within a few hours, the confusion on whether the Army actually was or was not to launch a satellite, showed how little had changed. . . . The President now has three top scientific advisers, Chairman Strauss of the AEC, Dr. Killian and Dr. Howard L. Bevis, of Ohio State, who is chairman of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers. . . . Not one of these three is a scientist. . . . All are administrators. . . . Dr. Killian was trained in business administration. . . . An index of the President's vagueness: Chairman Strauss is his oldest scientific adviser, his mainstay on atomic matters, yet at the dedication of the new AEC office building at nearby Germantown, Mr. Eiseenhower consistently pronounced his name "Strouse" whereas the Chairman has always pronounced it "Straws". . . .

Quis Custodiet . . . ?

Perhaps the new Senate preparedness sub-committee which will investigate missiles ought to begin by taking a close look at it own chief counsel, Edwin L. Weisl of the New York law firm of Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett. . . . Weisl represented Floyd B. Odlum of Atlas Corporation in the famous B-36 hearings here in 1948-9; Odlum was then chairman of Consolidated Vultee which makes the bombers. . . . Weisl said he still represents Odlum but Atlas no longer controls Consolidated Vultee. . . . Atlas is a giant investment trust which can hardly be without interest in the missiles field Weisl will be investigating. . . .

A Week's Wistful Understatements

"Obviously a nuclear weapon is never going to be very pleasant for anyone who is in its immediate target area. . . . I am not advocating limited war as something that I would enjoy engaging in."

—Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Face The Nation, Nov. 10.

". . . on the way over here I was telling Mr. [J. Edgar] Hoover I couldn't think of a single secret we had in the government that hadn't already appeared in the papers."

—President Eisenhower at the FBI Academy, Nov. 8.

"Peace has almost fallen into disrepute, even among Christians."

—Rev. E. O. Miller, St. George's, N.Y.C., Nov. 10.

The New Civil Rights Commission

Chief reaction of interested Negro groups in the Capitol to the new Civil Rights Commission were (1) satisfaction, that it finally had been appointed, (2) relief, that the Southerners named to it were not worse, and (3) wry comment, that the one Negro chosen is an Assistant Secretary of Labor and therefore firmly under Administration control. . . . There is still considerable anxiety that confirmation of the members by the Senate and appointment of the full time staff director yet to be named (also subject to confirmation) may be dragged out for months. . . . The Senate Judiciary Committee under Eastland will certainly try to delay action as long as possible.

Stevenson Hooked?

Many old friends of Adlai Stevenson feel he is accepting power without responsibility by becoming a "consultant" for the forthcoming NATO meeting instead of sketching out an independent foreign policy position of his own. . . . That *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists'* press release, with an appeal by Soviet scientists for a world parley on atomic dangers, which we published in our issue of October 28, finally appeared in the *New York Times* on November 10, page 32. . . .

Travel Dept.: Donald Ogden Stewart, who refused to sign a non-Communist affidavit going back more than 14 years, was granted a passport by the State Dept. under judicial pressure but Si Gerson of the *Daily Worker* was refused one. The last *Daily Worker* correspondent given a passport was Joseph Clark, who quit the Party in disgust after returning. Who is the Department protecting? . . . The House Un-American Activities Committee is so hard up for publicity that it made the quixotic "abolition" campaign of the tiny Emergency Civil Liberties Committee the excuse for a special report saying that a "plot" to destroy the House committee had reached "almost nation-wide proportions." . . . Would it were true. . . . If it's a crime to be for the abolition of the House committee, the role of such criminals is a growing and distinguished one, beginning with Chief Justice Warren and a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court. . . . A headline which epitomizes current hysteria was the *Washington Post's* two liner on page one Armistice Day, "Finletter Warns Nation It Must Control Space." . . . There will soon be no room left for God.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Text No U.S. Paper Published: A Great Soldier on Sputnik's Real Challenge

Gen. Bradley Calls for "Peaceful Accommodation" Rather Than Missile Race

The great soldier who led the First Army in the attack on the Normandy beaches, General Omar N. Bradley, is also the first top level American public figure to launch an attack on the real challenge of Sputnik. We reprint the plea he made at the St. Alban's School convocation here on Nov. 5. We believe these wise words deserve the widest circulation, and urge readers to order reprints in bulk for mass distribution.—IFS

By Gen. of the Army Omar N. Bradley

The central problem of our time—as I view it—is how to employ human intelligence for the salvation of mankind. It is a problem we have put upon ourselves. For we have defiled our intellect by the creation of such scientific instruments of destruction that we are now in desperate danger of destroying ourselves. Our plight is critical and with each effort we have made to relieve it by further scientific advance, we have succeeded only in aggravating our peril.

As a result, we are now speeding inexorably toward a day when even the ingenuity of our scientists may be unable to save us from the consequences of a single rash act or a lone reckless hand upon the switch of an uninterceptable missile. For twelve years now we've sought to stave off this ultimate threat of disaster by devising arms which would be both ultimate and disastrous.

An Electronic House of Cards

This irony can probably be compounded a few more years, or perhaps even a few decades. Missiles will bring anti-missiles, and anti-missiles will bring anti-anti-missiles. But inevitably, this whole electronic house of cards will reach a point where it can be constructed no higher.

At that point we shall have come to the peak of this whole incredible dilemma into which the world is shoving itself. And when that time comes there will be little we can do other than to settle down uneasily, smother our fears, and attempt to live in a thickening shadow of death.

Should this situation come to pass, we would have but one single and thin thread to cling to. We call it rationale or reason. We reason that no Government, no single group of men —indeed, not even one willful individual—would be so foolhardy, so reckless, as to precipitate a war which would most surely end in mutual destruction.

Was Hitler Amenable to Reason?

This reasoning may have the benefit of logic. But even logic sometimes goes awry. How can we assume that reason will prevail in a crisis when there is ordinarily so little reason among men. To those who would take comfort in the likelihood of an atomic peace to be secured solely by rationale and reason, I would recall the lapse of reason in a bunker under the Reich Chancellery in Berlin. It failed before, it can fail again.

Have we already gone too far in this search for peace through the accumulation of peril? Is there any way to halt this trend—or must we push on with new devices until we inevitably come to judgment before the atom. I believe there is a way out. And I believe it because I have acquired in my lifetime a decent respect for human intelligence.

It may be that the problems of accommodation in a world split by rival ideologies are more difficult than those with which we have struggled in the construction of ballistics missiles. But I believe, too, that if we apply to these human problems, the energy, creativity, and the perseverance we have devoted to science, even problems of accommodation will yield to reason. Admittedly, the problem of peaceful accommodation in the world is infinitely more difficult than the conquest of space, infinitely more complex than a trip to the moon. But if we will only come to the realization that it must be worked out—whatever it may mean even to such sacred traditions as absolute national sovereignty—I believe that we can somehow, somewhere, and perhaps through some as yet undiscovered world thinker and leader find a workable solution.

The Faith We Need

I confess that this is as much an article of faith as it is an expression of reason. But this, my friends, is what we need, faith in our ability to do what must be done. Without that faith we shall never get started. And until we get started, we shall never know what can be done.

If I am sometimes discouraged, it is not by the magnitude of the problem, but by our colossal indifference to it. I am unable to understand why—if we are willing to trust in reason as a restraint on the use of a ready-made ready-to-fire bomb—we do not make greater, more diligent and more imaginative use of reason and human intelligence in seeking an accord and compromise which will make it possible for mankind to control the atom and banish it as an instrument of war.

This is the real and—indeed—the most strenuous challenge to man's intellect today. By comparison with it, the conquest of space is of small significance. For until we learn how to live together, until we rid ourselves of the strife that mocks our pretensions of civilization, our adventures in science—instead of producing human progress—will continue to crowd it with greater peril.

The Satellite On Which We Live

We can compete with a Sputnik and probably create bigger and better Sputniks of our own. But what are we doing to prevent the Sputnik from evolving into just one more weapons system? And when are we going to muster an intelligence equal to that applied against the Sputnik and dedicate it to the preservation of this Satellite on which we live?

How long—I would ask you—can we put off salvation?

When does humanity run out?

If enough of us believe strongly enough in the ability of intelligent human beings to get together on some basis of a just accord, we might somehow, somewhere, in some way and under some auspices make a start on it.

Unless we soon get started, it may be too late.

We can't sit about waiting for some felicitous accident of history that may somehow make the world all right. Time is running against us, and it is running against us with the speed of a Sputnik.

If we're going to save ourselves from the instruments of our own intellect, we had better soon get ourselves under control and begin making the world safe for living.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U. S. Commissioner of Education Glosses Over Our Own Regimentation of the Mind

Soviet Union Not The Only Place Where Secret Police Watch Schools

(*Continued from Page One*)

The Only Occupation Financially Deteriorating

But the most striking contrast obvious in the earlier drafts was between the college professor there and here. The report made last July by the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School pointed out that college teaching salaries in this country are "startlingly low", that teaching was the only major occupation "in which there has been a relative, and in the senior ranks, an absolute deterioration of economic status in this country" and that "quite frequently the starting salary of the young graduate entering business or industry is higher than the pay of the experienced teacher who has just prepared him." The low pay itself, as Secretary Folsom said in his speech at Chicago, is "simply a reflection of a more fundamental fault—the lack of respect accorded to teaching by the public." It is important to change both the salary levels and the public attitude. Earlier drafts of the report on Soviet Education (as may be seen from two typical omissions in the box on page one) strongly stressed the higher position and the higher respect accorded teacher, scholar and scientist in the U.S.S.R. All this has been smudged in revision because it touches the tender nerve of Eisenhower Administration fiscal policy. We would have to spend as much on education as on strategic bombers to make the educational reforms implied.

More Cant About That American Way

The report was further fuzzed in the public mind by the kind of self-serving cant which got U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick's picture in the papers as a champion of the American way. "We in America," he said in releasing the report, "know that freedom is indispensable to good education, that liberty of the mind accomplishes more than regimentation." But any sober view must recognize that regimentation has increased in our own country, that education has increasingly been channelled into glorifying a quasi mythical free enterprise, that teachers have been brow-beaten, textbook writers brain-washed and independent minded students blacklisted under the impact of the witch hunt. The report pictures the surveillance maintained by the Soviet secret police over teachers, students and administrative personnel but nowhere notes astringently that a similar type of surveillance through a network of FBI informers has also grown up here, from the high school level. Students have been made fearful that expressions of non-political conformity may cost them fellowships and future employment while many excellent teachers have been exiled from the educational system for unorthodox political views or associations, present or past. "Soviet students," the report says smugly, "lack the encouragement given to American students to freely develop critical faculties, learn to differentiate between opposing points of view, and make up their own minds on controversial questions." Every classroom teacher here will recognize how little resemblance this bears to reality. Can we achieve improvement if we engage in such self-deception?

How the Faculties Subsidize Colleges

"In 1954 half of the college faculty in this country earned less than $5400 a year. At the rates then prevailing, one out of two college teachers could aspire no higher than a lifetime maximum of $7,000 a year, even if he should attain to the rank of full professor...

"At present salary levels the teacher in effect subsidizes the education of the individual student and the benefits that society derives therefrom.... On an overall national basis, an average salary structure competitive with comparable professions would cost over $800 million dollars in additional annual payroll.

"This is roughly the size of the present subsidy of higher education by its faculties in a single year. It is nearly eight times the total alumni contributions in 1956. It is also nearly eight times the size of current corporation support to colleges and universities, and over five times the total endowment income. It means that college faculties as a whole contribute more dollars to higher education than all other individual and corporate donors combined."

—Second Report, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, pps. 33-5.

The Many Kind Notes Coming In With Renewals and the Gift Subs Deeply Appreciated

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $4 (1 yr.) or $2 (6 mos.) additional: 11/18/57

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED